(e) why did the officer who had once recommended the construction of the aqueduct as a permanent work later on recommend that temporary arrangements made every year would serve the purpose well;

(f) what is the reason for not answering the latter portion of sub-division (h);

(g) whether its answer will now be furnished;

(h) whether representations or petitions have been received by the Government to extend the channel and make it more useful;

(i) whether the request has been granted; and if not

(j) what is the reason for not extending the irrigation facilities prayed for;

(k) whether the extension of the channel will be useful to the ryots?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a) No.

(b) If it is restored to the old condition it is likely to be again damaged.

(c) Wherever possible works damaged by any cause whatever are modified during reconstruction so as to eliminate the weak points, if any, in the design.

(d) The levels in the supply channel did not permit the aqueduct being placed above high water. The idea therefore was that the trough plates should be removed before the arrival of floods. If this were done, no damage would have resulted. The abnormal floods of 1106 came in at a very unusual period and this prevented the troughs being removed in time by the watchman. On account of this uncertainty it was thought that the aqueduct could be supported on temporary struts every year after floods.

(e) Vide answer to sub-division (d). Even in the original work, the design demanded the removal of trough plates during floods.

(f) It was an omission.

(g) Yes. (1) 12—2—1107
(2) 27—8—1107 and
(3) 15—2—1108.

(h) Yes.

(i) No.

(j) The Member is referred to the answer to the question No. 107 of the Vrischigam Session.

(k) Yes.

Road—Cheruvallikkadavu.

50. Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(a) whether the Road Board had approved of including in the list of works to be provided for in the 1108 budget, opening a road at Cheruvallikkadavu in Anjur Village;

(b) whether the road has been opened; and if not

(c) what has been done in the matter;

(d) whether provision for this road has been included in the budget proposals for 1109 submitted by the Public Works Department; and if not

(e) what is the reason for not doing so;

(f) whether provision for this road had been included in the budget proposals for 1108 submitted by the Public Works Department; and if not

(g) what is the reason for not doing so?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(a), (b) and (c) The work was included in the list considered by the Road Board but could not be provided for in the budget for want of funds.

(d) No.

(e) Want of funds.

(f) No.

(g) Want of funds.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly